

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vitemia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/056,530 01/24/2002 Leonard L. Diaddario, JR. PVO 2 0009 4334 7590 10/06/2004 EXAMINER Scott A. McCollister ZHENG, LOIS L Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP 7th Floor ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1100 Superior Avenue 1742 Cleveland, OH 44114-2518 DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/056,530	DIADDARIO, ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lois Zheng	1742
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, on. , a reply within the statutory minimun period will apply and will expire SIX (statute, cause the application to be application to be application to be application.	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	20 July 2004	
	This action is non-final.	~
3) Since this application is in condition for al		matters prosecution as to the morito is
closed in accordance with the practice un	der Ex parte Quavle. 193	5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213
Disposition of Claims	•	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
·	-4: - · -	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6,10 and 16-27</u> is/are allowed.	ndrawn from consideratio	1.
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8,9 and 11-15</u> is/are rejected		
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	·
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requiremer	it.
Application Papers	·	
<u>·</u>		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa		44-4-0
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) he held in a	d to by the Examiner.
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the control	ne Examiner Note the atta	wing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
		ioned Omoe Action of Ioff) PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	nonta have been seed at	•
a commendation of the priority document		
 Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But 		een received in this National Stage
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		not received
	or and continue copies	not received.
Attachment(s)		
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interv Pape	riew Summary (PTO-413) r No(s)/Mail Date
) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI	5) 🔲 Notic	e of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Patent and Trademark Office	6) Other	·
	ce Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 10012004

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in view of the amendment filed on 20 July 2004.

Claims 16-24 are allowable (see previous Office Action).

New claims 25-27 are added in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 7 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins US 4,801,337(Higgins).

The examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1-2, 7 and 11-15 for the same reason disclosed in the previous Office Action as is incorporated herein.

The amendments in claims 1 and 14 merely clarify the language and grammar of the claims and do not change the substance of the claims.

Art Unit: 1742

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see page 6-7 section C of the amendment, filed 20 July 2004, with respect to claims 1-2, 7 and 11-15 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks with respect to Higgins, applicants argued that:

- a) Higgins does not teach or show a mole ratio of nitrate to chromium plus cobalt ions of 1.5:1 or less;
- b) Higgins does not teach any specific nitrate ranges; and
- c) Higgins does not recognize the presence of either nitrate or the ratio of nitrate to Cr plus Co as important components.

In response to applicant's argument (a), the examiner relies on the more broad disclosure of polyvalent ion (e.g. cobalt) amount of 0.3 – 3 g/l. The amount of Co in Example 1, when implemented in an amount that is closer to the high limit of the disclosed range of Higgins (i.e. 3g/l), would significantly increase the total amount of Cr plus Co, which would produce a ratio of nitrate to Cr plus Co that is less than claimed ratio of 1.5:1. Therefore, the examiner maintains that the molar ratio of nitrate to Cr plus Co of Higgins overlaps the claimed ratio of nitrate to Cr plus Co of the instant invention.

5. In response to applicant's arguments (b) and (c), the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). In this case, even though Higgins does not explicitly teach the significance of

Art Unit: 1742

nitrate or the ratio of nitrate to Cr plus Co in the coating solution, it is sufficient for Higgins to teach the presence of nitrate as well as the ratio of nitrate to Cr plus Co in the coating solution as claimed. Mere recognition of another advantage of nitrate in the coating solution of Higgins does not render nonobvious an otherwise known invention. See MPEP 2145.

6. Applicant's arguments, see page 8 section D of the amendment, filed 20 July 2004, with respect to claims 3-6 and 8-10 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of 3-6 and 8-10 has been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 6, 10 and 25-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

A primary reason for the allowance of claims 6, 10 and 25-27 is that the prior art fails to teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the instantly claimed conversion coating bath composition where in the composition further comprises a film polisher agent with fluoride ion, sulfate ions and the coating bath is acidic.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lois Zheng whose telephone number is (571) 272-1248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1742

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LLZ

ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700